DAVID L. CHILD, M.D.

In the Matter of

Holder of License No. 6275 For the Practice of Allopathic Medicine In the State of Arizona CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR LETTER OF REPRIMAND

Case No. MD-05-0956A

CONSENT AGREEMENT

By mutual agreement and understanding, between the Arizona Medical Board ("Board") and David L. Child, M.D. ("Respondent"), the parties agreed to the following disposition of this matter.

- 1. Respondent has read and understands this Consent Agreement and the stipulated Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order ("Consent Agreement"). Respondent acknowledges that he has the right to consult with legal counsel regarding this matter.
- 2. By entering into this Consent Agreement, Respondent voluntarily relinquishes any rights to a hearing or judicial review in state or federal court on the matters alleged, or to challenge this Consent Agreement in its entirety as issued by the Board, and waives any other cause of action related thereto or arising from said Consent Agreement.
- 3. This Consent Agreement is not effective until approved by the Board and signed by its Executive Director.
- 4. The Board may adopt this Consent Agreement of any part thereof. This Consent Agreement, or any part thereof, may be considered in any future disciplinary action against Respondent.
- 5. This Consent Agreement does not constitute a dismissal or resolution of other matters currently pending before the Board, if any, and does not constitute any waiver,

express or implied, of the Board's statutory authority or jurisdiction regarding any other pending or future investigation, action or proceeding. The acceptance of this Consent Agreement does not preclude any other agency, subdivision or officer of this State from instituting other civil or criminal proceedings with respect to the conduct that is the subject of this Consent Agreement.

- 6. All admissions made by Respondent are solely for final disposition of this matter and any subsequent related administrative proceedings or civil litigation involving the Board and Respondent. Therefore, said admissions by Respondent are not intended or made for any other use, such as in the context of another state or federal government regulatory agency proceeding, civil or criminal court proceeding, in the State of Arizona or any other state or federal court.
- 7. Upon signing this agreement, and returning this document (or a copy thereof) to the Board's Executive Director, Respondent may not revoke the acceptance of the Consent Agreement. Respondent may not make any modifications to the document. Any modifications to this original document are ineffective and void unless mutually approved by the parties.
- 8. If the Board does not adopt this Consent Agreement, Respondent will not assert as a defense that the Board's consideration of this Consent Agreement constitutes bias, prejudice, prejudgment or other similar defense.
- 9. This Consent Agreement, once approved and signed, is a public record that will be publicly disseminated as a formal action of the Board and will be reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank and to the Arizona Medical Board's website.
- 10. If any part of the Consent Agreement is later declared void or otherwise unenforceable, the remainder of the Consent Agreement in its entirety shall remain in force and effect.

11. Any violation of this Consent Agreement constitutes unprofessional conduct and may result in disciplinary action. A.R.S. § § 32-1401(27)(r) ("[v]iolating a formal order, probation, consent agreement or stipulation issued or entered into by the board or its executive director under this chapter") and 32-1451.

Ward L. Child im. 2

AVID L. CHILD, M.D.

DATED: 10/11/06

- 1. The Board is the duly constituted authority for the regulation and control of the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- 2. Respondent is the holder of license number 6275 for the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- 3. The Board initiated case number MD-05-0956A after receiving a complaint regarding Respondent's care and treatment of a fifty-five year-old female patient ("JV").
- 4. On March 21, 2005, after being referred by her gynecologist ("Gynecologist"), JV presented to Respondent with a vaginal vault prolapse. Respondent noted "chronic pelvic pain, rectocele, USI [urinary stress incontinence]" and scheduled JV for surgery on March 30, 2005. Respondent did not document his discussion with JV about the procedure.
- 5. On March 30, 2005 JV was admitted for a sacral colpopexy, enterocele pilcation and posterior colporraphy. JV gave written consent for these procedures, but stated she informed Respondent in the pre-operative area she did not want her ovaries removed. There is no documentation in the record of this discussion. During the procedure, Respondent discovered JV had bilateral cysts of both ovaries and adhesions. Respondent performed a bilateral salpingo oopherectomy (BSO). Respondent noted he performed the BSO because JV had hydrosalpinx along with adhesions. However, the pathology report showed benign changes. Respondent performed the BSO without indication. JV did not give written informed consent for this procedure. Also, there is no documentation of Respondent informing JV of the procedure.
- 6. Respondent noted JV did well post-operatively. Respondent saw JV for post-operative visits on April 11, 2005, April 25, 2005 and June 2, 2005. However, there is no documentation in the record to state when he informed JV when he removed her ovaries.

- 7. On May 17, 2005 JV presented to her gynecologist complaining of pain with urination and back pain since surgery. Gynecologist ordered an ultrasound and a magnetic resonance imaging that were both negative. Subsequently, JV requested a copy of her medical record from Respondent. JV reviewed her record and realized Respondent removed her ovaries without discussion, her knowledge, and her informed consent.
- 8. On July 14, 2005 JV presented to Respondent for her post-operative visit and complained of USI and on-going pelvic pain since surgery. JV refused an examination and confronted Respondent regarding the BSO procedure he performed without her permission or knowledge. Respondent referred JV to Gynecologist.
- 9. A physician is required to maintain adequate legible medical records containing, at a minimum, sufficient information to identify the patient, support the diagnosis, justify the treatment, accurately document the results, indicate advice and cautionary warnings provided to the patient and provide sufficient information for another practitioner to assume continuity of the patient's care at any point in the course of treatment. A.R.S. § 32-1401(2). Respondent's records were inadequate because he did not document his discussion with JV about the rectocele and USI procedures and did not document that JV did not want her ovaries removed.
- 10. The standard of care for a patient presenting with an enterocele, rectocele and USI required Respondent to perform a complete examination, discuss options for surgery with the patient and obtain informed consent for the procedures scheduled or anticipated. The standard of care when performing the BSO and Burch procedures requires a physician to have adequate indications for the procedures.
- 11. Respondent deviated from the standard of care because he did not perform a complete examination, discuss options for surgery with JV and obtain informed consent from JV prior to performing a BSO and Burch procedures. Respondent deviated from the

standard of care because he did not have adequate indications to perform the BSO and Burch procedures.

12. Respondent's failure to perform a complete examination and discuss surgery options led to the removal of JV's ovaries without her informed consent.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- The Board possesses jurisdiction over the subject matter hereof and over Respondent.
- 2. The conduct and circumstances described above constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(e) ("[f]ailing or refusing to maintain adequate records on a patient.").
- 3. The conduct and circumstances described above constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401(27)(q) ("[a]ny conduct or practice that is or might be harmful or dangerous to the health of the patient or the public").
- 4. The conduct and circumstances described above constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401 (27)(II) ("[c]onduct that the board determines is gross negligence, repeated negligence or negligence resulting in harm to or the death of a patient.")

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. Respondent is issued a Letter of Reprimand for removal of ovaries without indication and without informed consent and for failure to inform the patient her ovaries were removed.

ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

TIMOTHY C.MILLER, J.D. **Executive Director**

ORIGINAL of the foregoing filed this 6 day of December, 2006 with:

9545 E. Doubletree Ranch Road

EXECUTED COPY of the foregoing mailed this 8th day of the foregoing mailed